

REMARKS

The Official Action dated October 13, 2006 has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herewith, taken with the following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

By the present Amendment, Claims 1, 5, 12 and 13 have been amended and claims 2, 4, 6, and 8-11 have been cancelled and claim 14 has been added. Support for the claim amendments and the newly added claim may be found in original claims 1-13. Since these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter, entry is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph by asserting that the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is believed that the presently amended claims particularly claim and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Whereby this rejection has been overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-13 under the judicially created doctrine of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/485,493). Applicants with this response have filed a terminal disclaimer to overcome the provisional rejection based on nonstatutory double patenting. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 2005/0173981). The Examiner asserted that Stewart teach

a location information sharing method. The Examiner asserted that Stewart discloses registering location information including a location coordinate and a location ID into a location information domain server by a wired or wireless internet terminal; searching the registered location information corresponding to the location ID which is received by another terminal; transmitting the searched location information from the location information server to the wired or wireless internet terminal that requests the information; automatically performing various application functions such as map view. The Examiner concedes that Stewart fails to teach or disclose linking the application software with the location coordinate included in the location information received. The Examiner asserts that since Stewart teaches the capability of displaying a map with relative locations of business on the map and since including application software to display maps on a mobile terminal and using the geographic location of certain points of interest to be displayed the correct location of the points of interest would have been both known and obvious. The Examiner asserts that Stewart obviously encompasses linking the application software of the terminal to the location information in order to provide map display with locations of the business the user is interested in.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the methods defined by claims 1, 5, 12 and 13 are non-obvious and patentably distinguishable from Stewart.

Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981; 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Moreover, in order for references to be relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 they must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.*, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1565

(Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Stewart fail to satisfy these requirements.

Stewart discloses a system and method for enabling a business to register a domain location to provide location based services to on-site customers. The system includes a network, an access point coupled to the network, and a memory medium storing a registry comprising domain location entries, each comprising a domain name and geographical location of the business. The registry is accessible through the network via the access point and is useable in creating geographic based web content for one or more businesses. The system and method of Stewart provide a customer network access and allow a customer at the site of the business to access the Internet or other external network. The system may first provide a forced first page to intercept the URL request from the customer's computer and return the home page or other predefined page before allowing the customer to then access the internet.

The Examiner is apparently confused in regards to the teaching of Stewart and "location based services". The location based services of Stewart provide network or Internet access to customers who are visiting their businesses.

The present invention, as defined by claim 1 relates to a location information sharing method based on wired and wireless internet using location identification (ID). A location information sharing method based on wired and wireless internet using location identification (ID), the method is characterized by: writing a location ID in a content of a document and linking the location ID to a URL, wherein the location ID comprises a UserID and DomainName separated by a separator symbol, and wherein the URL includes the UserID and DomainName as parameters; searching a registered location information utilizing a location ID linked to a URL on one of a plural of location information domain servers, wherein a wired or wireless terminal

connects with a web site corresponding to the URL and connects with one of a plural of location information domain servers using an IP address corresponding to the DomainName of the location ID and request the location information domain server to search a location information corresponding to the UserID of the location ID; transmitting the location information including a coordinate value searched by the location ID from the location information domain server to the wired or wireless terminal requesting the location information; and performing application functions, wherein the application functions include viewing a map around a location coordinate contained in the location information corresponding to location ID on the wired or wireless terminal. Stewart fails to teach or disclose several of the limitations of the presently claimed invention. It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed methods are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Stewart, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 2005/0173981) in view of Shuster et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,687,746). The Examiner asserted that the identity of the location coordinate would obviously have been stored with the identity of the terminal access point. The Examiner further asserted that inputting the ID to be stored with other information would have been well known. The Examiner further asserted that Shuster teach storing the registered information in the domain server and teaches storing the information when the domain name is available and the availability of the domain name is available only when the same domain name has not been used or selected, Shuster obviously encompasses teaching registering the information when the location ID is not duplication. The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the checking steps for duplicated location

IS as taught by Shuster to the location information sharing method taught by Stewart in order to prevent different user to select the same ID and to prevent the same user to create multiple location information.

However, as will be set forth in detail below, it is submitted that the methods defined by claims 1, 5, 12 and 13 are non-obvious and patentably distinguishable from Stewart in view of Shuster et al. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981; 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). Moreover, in order for references to be relied upon to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 they must provide an enabling disclosure, i.e., they must place the claimed invention in the possession of the public. *Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd.*, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Payne*, 203 U.S.P.Q. 245 (CCPA 1979). Stewart in view of Shuster et al. fail to satisfy these requirements.

The teachings of Stewart are discussed above. Shuster et al. is directed to a domain name management system and method for hosting and assigning domain names. The methods creates user assigned subdomain names by combining the hosting domain name and the user name request such that the subdomain name resides within the zone file of the hosting domain name, i.e. resides at the same IP address.

The deficiencies of Stewart are not overcome with the combination of Shuster et al. Moreover, Stewart alone or in combination with Shuster, fail to teach or suggest several of the limitations of the presently claimed invention. It is therefore submitted that the presently claimed methods are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from Stewart in view of

Shuster et al., whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-1133, including any filing fees under 37 CFR 1.16 for presentation of extra claims and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17.

It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§103 and 112, and places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Geoffrey L. Oberhaus /
Geoffrey L. Oberhaus
Registration No. 42,955
Attorney for Applicant
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 977-8623